

#### REMARKS

Claims 1-58 are in the application. The drawings were objected to. Claims 1-11, 17-31, 33-38, 41-43, and 48-58 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being unpatentable over Wong (US Patent 6,700,891) in view of Sheafor et al. (US Patent 6,223,242). Claims 12-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Sheafor et al. and Jung et al. (US Patent 5,745,229). Claims 32, 39, 40, 44, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Sheafor et al. and Fairchild et al. (US Patent 6,343,320). Claims 46 and 47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of Sheafor et al. and Zintel (US Patent 6,779, 004).

With respect to the rejection of the drawings as not including reference 224 in Figure 10 mentioned on page 32 of the specification, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of the specification and figures. Applicant has identified a typographical error in the cited text of the specification (namely that reference numeral 224 should be reference 223) and has amended the cited portion of the specification accordingly. Applicant submits that the amended paragraph is consistent with the drawings, and requests that the rejection of the drawings be withdrawn. Should the Examiner have any additional questions regarding Figure 10, Applicant requests the opportunity for a telephone interview with the Examiner.

With respect to the provisional rejection of claims 1-58 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of claims 1-45, 47, 49-59, and 62 of co pending App. Ser. No. 09/746,519, while Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, a terminal disclaimer is being submitted under separate cover, which should obviate this rejection.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful review of both the claims and the Applicants previous remarks with respect to the present rejections. Applicant has noted that the Examiner has indicated that the claims as previously amended did not clearly recite certain distinguishing aspects. While Applicant believes that the previously amended claims are patentably distinct from the cited combination of references, in an effort to expedite prosecution, and to make certain aspects of the claims more clear, Applicant has chosen to amend claims 1 and 4. In particular, Applicant has amended the

two independent claims 1 and 4 to more precisely recite certain aspects relating to the manner in which the PLD system in real time selectively operates to filter packets or block packet transmission in response to a state of the user-activated switch/button interface. Exemplary support for these amendments in the specification can be found on page 19: lines 15-30, page 31: lines 3-8, and page 32: lines 8-14. The cited combinations of references do not describe such a user-activated switch/button interface for a PLD system, particularly as directed towards such real time use by an end user. Applicant submits that, for at least these reasons, and the reasons previously described, all claims should be allowable over the cited references. Should the Examiner have any additional questions regarding these remarks, Applicant requests the opportunity for a telephone interview with the Examiner.

Finally, Applicant notes that it is still reviewing whether or not Wong is in fact prior art to Applicant's invention. While Applicant does not admit that Wong is in fact prior art to Applicant's invention, and Applicant may demonstrate in the future that Applicant's invention predates Wong, Applicant has chosen herein to emphasize the clear distinction of the claimed invention over the cited combination of references.

Reconsideration and allowance is requested.

Please charge any additional fees due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-0251.

No new matter has been added.

Respectfully submitted,



Alan R. Loudermilk  
Registration No. 32,788  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

September 4, 2007  
Loudermilk & Associates  
P.O. Box 3607  
Los Altos, CA 94024-0607  
408-868-1516

I hereby certify that the foregoing is being faxed via 571-273-8300 to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date indicated above.

